arXiv:1607.05392v1 [math.CO] 19 Jul 2016

Extremal anti-forcing numbers of perfect matchings of graphs*

Kai Deng[a,b], Heping Zhang[a,†]

[a]School of Mathematics and Statistics, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, Gansu 730000, P. R. China

[b]School of Mathematics and Information Science, Beifang University of Nationalities, Yinchuan, Ningxia 750027, P. R. China

Abstract

The anti-forcing number of a perfect matching M of a graph G is the minimal number of edges not in M whose removal to make M as a unique perfect matching of the resulting graph. The set of anti-forcing numbers of all perfect matchings of G is the anti-forcing spectrum of G. In this paper, we characterize the plane elementary bipartite graph whose minimum anti-forcing number is one. We show that the maximum anti-forcing number of a graph is at most its cyclomatic number. In particular, we characterize the graphs with the maximum anti-forcing number achieving the upper bound, such extremal graphs are a class of plane bipartite graphs. Finally, we determine the anti-forcing spectrum of an even polygonal chain in linear time.

Keywords: Perfect matching; Elementary bipartite graph;Cyclomatic number; Anti-forcing number; Anti-forcing spectrum; Even polygonal chain.

1 Introduction

We only consider finite and simple graphs. Let G be a graph with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G)$. A *perfect matching* or 1-factor of G is a set of disjoint edges which covers all vertices of G. A perfect matching of a graph coincides with a Kekulé structure in organic chemistry and a dimer in statistic physics.

The concept of "forcing" has been used in many research fields in graph theory and combinatorics [3, 16]. It appeared first in a perfect matching M of a graph G due to

*Supported by NSFC (grant no. 11371180 and 11401279).

†Corresponding author.

E-mail address: dengkai04@126.com (K. Deng), zhanghp@lzu.edu.cn (H. Zhang).

Harary et al. [8]: If a subset S of M is not contained in other perfect matchings of G, then we say S *forces* the perfect matching M, in other words, S is called a *forcing set* of M. The minimum cardinality over all forcing sets of M is called the *forcing number* of M. The roots of those concepts can be found in an earlier chemical literature due to Randić and Klein [11], under the name of the *innate degree of freedom* of a Kekulé structure, which plays an important role in the resonance theory in chemistry. In 1990's Zhang and Li [25] and Hansen and Zheng [7] determined independently the hexagonal systems with a forcing edge. Afterwards Zhang and Zhang [27] characterized plane elementary bipartite graphs with a forcing edge. For more researches on matching forcing problems, see [1, 2, 9, 10, 17, 18, 21, 24, 26].

Vukičević and Trinajstić [19] introduced the *anti-forcing number* of a graph G as the smallest number of edges whose removal results in a subgraph with a unique perfect matching, denoted by $af(G)$. So a graph G has a unique perfect matching if and only if its anti-forcing number is zero. An edge e of a graph G is called an *anti-forcing edge* if $G - e$ has a unique perfect matching. As early as 1997 Li [13] showed that the hexagonal systems with an anti-forcing edge (under the name "forcing single edge") are truncated parallelograms. Deng [4] gave a linear time algorithm to compute the anti-forcing number of benzenoid chains. Yang et al. [22] showed that a fullerene has the anti-forcing number at least four. For other works, see [5, 20, 23].

Recently, Lei et al. [12] defined the anti-forcing number of a perfect matching M of a graph G as the minimal number of edges not in M whose removal to make M as a single perfect matching of the resulting graph, denoted by $af(G, M)$. By this definition, $af(G)$ is the smallest anti-forcing number over all perfect matchings of G, called the *minimum anti-forcing number* of G. Also let $Af(G)$ denote the largest anti-forcing number over all perfect matchings of G, called the *maximum anti-forcing number* of G. They also showed that the maximum anti-forcing number of a hexagonal system equals its fries number. The present authors [6] considered the *anti-forcing spectrum* $\mathrm{Spec}_{af}(G)$ as the set of anti-forcing numbers of perfect matchings in G.

Let M be a perfect matching of a graph G. A subset $S \subseteq E(G)\backslash M$ is called an *anti-forcing set* of M if M is the unique perfect matching of $G - S$. A cycle C of G is called an *M-alternating cycle* if the edges of C appear alternately in M and $E(G)\backslash M$. If C is an M-alternating cycle of G, then the symmetric difference $M \triangle C := (M - C) \cup (C - M)$ is another perfect matching of G. In this case a cycle is always regarded as its edge set.

Theorem 1.1 [12]**.** An edge set S of a graph G is an anti-forcing set of a perfect matching M of G if and only if S contains at least one edge of every M-alternating cycle of G.

Let M be a perfect matching of a graph G. A set $\mathcal{A}$ of M-alternating cycles of G is called a *compatible M-alternating set* if any two members of $\mathcal{A}$ either are disjoint

or intersect only at edges in M. Let $c'(M)$ denote the cardinality of a maximum compatible M-alternating set of G. By Theorem 1.1, we have $af(G, M) \geq c'(M)$. For plane bipartite graphs, the equality holds.

Theorem 1.2 [12]**.** Let G be a plane bipartite graph with a perfect matching M. Then $af(G, M) = c'(M)$.

Throughout this paper all the bipartite graphs are given a proper black and white coloring: any two adjacent vertices receive different colors. An edge of a graph G is *allowed* if it belongs to a perfect matching of G and *forbidden* otherwise. G is said to be *elementary* if all its allowed edges form a connected subgraph of G. It is well-known that a connected bipartite graph is elementary if and only if each edge is allowed [14].

An elementary bipartite graph has the so-called "*bipartite ear decomposition*". Let x be an edge. Join the end vertices of x by a path P_1 of odd length (the so-called "first ear"). We proceed inductively to build a sequence of bipartite graphs as follows: If $G_{r-1} = x+P_1+P_2+\cdots+P_{r-1}$ has already been constructed, add the r-th ear P_r (a path of odd length) by joining any two vertices in different colors of G_{r-1} such that P_r has no other vertices in common with G_{r-1}. The decomposition $G_r = x+P_1+P_2+\cdots+P_r$ will be called a bipartite ear decomposition of G_r.

Theorem 1.3 [15]**.** A bipartite graph is elementary if and only if it has a bipartite ear decomposition.

A bipartite ear decomposition $G = x + P_1 + P_2 + \cdots + P_r$ can be represented by a sequence of graphs $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_r(= G))$, where $G_0 = x$ and $G_i = G_{i-1} + P_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. We can see that the number of ears equals $|E(G)| - |V(G)| + 1$, i.e., the *cyclomatic number* of G, denoted by $r(G)$.

A bipartite ear decomposition $(G_1(= x + P_1), \ldots, G_r(= G))$ of a plane elementary bipartite graph G is called a *reducible face decomposition* if G_1 is the boundary of an interior face of G and the i-th ear P_i lies in the exterior of G_{i-1} such that P_i and the part of the periphery of G_{i-1} bound an interior face of G for all $2 \leq i \leq r$.

Theorem 1.4 [27]**.** Let G be a plane bipartite graph other than K_2. Then G is elementary if and only if G has a reducible face decomposition starting with the boundary of any interior face of G.

In the next section, we characterize the plane elementary bipartite graphs with anti-forcing edges by using reducible face decomposition. In section 3, we show that the maximum anti-forcing number of a connected graph with a perfect matching is at most its cyclomatic number. In particular we characterize the graphs with the maximum anti-forcing number achieving this cyclomatic number in terms of bipartite ear decomposition. We shall see that such extremal graphs are a special type of plane

bipartite graphs, and have a unique perfect matching whose anti-forcing number is maximum. In Section 4, we show that an even polygonal chain including benzenoid chain has the continuous anti-forcing spectrum. So we can determine the anti-forcing spectrum by designing linear algorithms to compute the minimum and maximum anti-forcing numbers of an even polygonal chain.

2 Anti-forcing edge

The *Z-transformation graph* $Z(G)$ of a plane bipartite graph G is defined as the graph whose vertices represent the perfect matchings of G where two vertices are adjacent if and only if the symmetric difference of the corresponding two perfect matchings just forms the boundary of an interior face of G. A face of G is said to be *resonance* if its boundary is an M-alternating cycle with respect to a perfect matching M of G. By using reducible face decomposition, Zhang and Zhang [27] described those plane elementary bipartite graphs whose Z-transformation graphs have a vertex of degree one and characterized the plane elementary bipartite graphs with a forcing edge.

Theorem 2.1 [27]**.** A plane elementary bipartite graph G has a forcing edge if and only if G has a perfect matching M such that G has exactly two M-resonance faces (the exterior face is allowed) and their boundaries are intersecting. Further each common edge in M on the two M-resonance faces is a forcing edge of G.

In the following, we characterize plane elementary bipartite graphs with an anti-forcing edge. The following lemma is useful.

Lemma 2.2 [14]**.** Let G be a bipartite graph with a unique perfect matching. Then G must contain at least one vertex of degree 1 in each color class.

By Theorem 1.1, the following result is immediate.

Lemma 2.3. Let G be a graph with a perfect matching M. Then $e \in E(G) \setminus M$ is an anti-forcing edge if and only if each M-alternating cycle passes through e.

Theorem 2.4. A plane elementary bipartite graph G has an anti-forcing edge if and only if G has a perfect matching M such that G has exactly two M-resonance faces whose boundaries have a common path with length at least 3.

Proof. Let $e = uv$ be an anti-forcing edge of G. Then $G - e$ has a unique perfect matching M (we may say M is anti-forced by e). By Lemma 2.2, $G - e$ has at least two vertices of degree 1. Since G is 2-connected, only u and v are of degree 1 in $G - e$. Let f (resp. g) be the edge which is incident to u (resp. v) in $G - e$. Then $f \in M$ (resp. $g \in M$) is a forcing edge of G. By Theorem 2.1, G has exactly two M-resonant

faces and their boundaries s_1 and s_2 are intersecting. By Lemma 2.3, s_1 and s_2 both pass through e. Since u and v both are of degree 2 in G, three edges f, e and g form a path with length at least 3 lying on both s_1 and s_2.

Conversely, suppose for a perfect matching M of G there are exactly two M-resonance faces of G whose boundaries have a common path P with length at least 3 Then P has a pair of adjacent edges e and f such that $e \notin M$ and $f \in M$. By Theorem 2.1, f is a forcing edge of G. Note that a perfect matching M of $G - e$ contains f. Hence M is a unique perfect matching of $G - e$, and thus e is an anti-forcing edge of G. □

From Theorem 2.4 a plane elementary bipartite graph with an anti-forcing edge can be given an ear construction. For example, see Fig. 1. According to Theorems 2.1 and 2.4, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.5. Let G be a plane elementary bipartite graph with an anti-forcing edge. Then G must have a forcing edge.



Fig. 1. An ear construction for a plane bipartite graph with an anti-forcing edge x.

3 Maximum anti-forcing number

Theorem 3.1. Let G be a connected graph with a perfect matching. Then $Af(G) \leq r(G)$. Further, if G is nonbipartite, then $Af(G) < r(G)$.

Proof. Let M be any perfect matching of G. If G has a cycle C_1, then there is an edge $e_1 \in E(C_1) \setminus M$ such that $G - e_1$ is connected and M is a perfect matching of $G - e_1$. If $G - e_1$ also contains a cycle C_2, then we can delete an edge $e_2 \in E(C_2) \setminus M$ from $G - e_1$ such that $G - e_1 - e_2$ is connected and M is a perfect matching of $G - e_1 - e_2$. Repeating this procedure, finally we can obtain a spanning tree T of G such that M is a unique perfect matching of T. So $E(G) \setminus E(T)$ is an anti-forcing set of M in G, and $af(G, M) \leq |E(G) \setminus E(T)| = r(G)$. It implies that $Af(G) \leq r(G)$.

Since tree T is a bipartite graph, its vertex set can be partitioned into two partite sets X and Y. If G is nonbipartite, then there must be an edge e of $E(G) \setminus E(T)$ such that both ends of e are in X or Y. Therefore, $T + e$ contains a unique cycle, which

is odd. So $T + e$ has no M-alternating cycles. That is, M is still a unique perfect matching of $T + e$. Hence M is anti-forced by $E(G) \setminus E(T + e)$, and $af(G, M) \leq |E(G) \setminus E(T + e)| < r(G)$, which implies that $Af(G) < r(G)$. □

In the following we characterize graphs G with $Af(G) = r(G)$. By Theorem 3.1, we only need to consider bipartite graphs. Let G be a bipartite graph with a perfect matching. An edge of G is said to be *fixed single* (resp. *double*) if it belongs to no (resp. all) perfect matchings of G. An edge of G is *fixed* if it is either fixed double edge or fixed single edge. The non-fixed edges of G form a subgraph of G, each component of which is elementary and called *elementary (or normal) component* of G. The proof of Lemma 4.5 in [12] also implies the below.

Lemma 3.2. Let G be a bipartite graph with a perfect matching M. Let $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_k$ be the normal components of G, $k \geq 1$. Then $af(G, M) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} af(G_i, M_i)$, where M_i is the restriction of M on G_i.

Lemma 3.3. Let G be a bipartite graph with a perfect matching. Then $Af(G) = r(G)$ if and only if each fixed edge of G is a cut-edge and for each normal component of G the maximum anti-forcing numbers is equal to its cyclomatic number.

Proof. If G has no normal components, then $Af(G) = 0$. In this case $Af(G) = r(G)$ if and only if G is a forest. Adapting the notations in Lemma 3.2, we assume that $k \geq 1$. Lemma 3.2 implies that $Af(G) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} Af(G_i)$. By Theorem 3.1, we have

$$Af(G) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} Af(G_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} r(G_i) \leq r(G).$$

So $Af(G) = r(G)$ if and only if $Af(G_i) = r(G_i)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{k} r(G_i) = r(G)$. The latter holds if and only if each fixed edge of G is a cut edge. □

From Lemma 3.3 we need to consider elementary bipartite graphs.

Lemma 3.4. Let G be an elementary bipartite graph other than K_2. Then $Af(G) = r(G)$ if and only if G has a perfect matching M and a bipartite ear decomposition $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_r(= G))$, $r := r(G) \geq 1$, such that $M_i = M \cap E(G_i)$ is a perfect matching of G_i, $0 \leq i \leq r$, and $u_i v_i \in M_{i-1}$ for the ends u_i and v_i of the i-th ear P_i, $1 \leq i \leq r$.

Proof. Sufficiency: Let $C_i = P_i + u_i v_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq r)$. Then $\{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_r\}$ is a compatible M-alternating set of G. By Theorem 1.1, $af(G, M) \geq r$. By Theorem 3.1, $af(G, M) \leq r$. So $af(G, M) = r$. It implies that $Af(G) = r$.

Necessity: Let M be a perfect matching of G with $af(G, M) = r$. From the proof of Theorem 3.1, G has a spanning tree T such that M is a unique perfect matching of T. Let $S = \{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_r\} := E(G) \setminus E(T)$, and C_i the unique cycle in $T + e_i$ for

$i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_r\}$. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is a system of fundamental cycles of G relative to T, which is a base of the cycle space of G.

Claim 1. $\mathcal{A}$ is a compatible M-alternating set.

Proof. We have that each C_i is M-alternating. Otherwise, there is a cycle C_j ($1 \leq j \leq r$) which is not M-alternating. So M is the unique perfect matching of $T + e_j$, and $S \setminus \{e_j\}$ is an anti-forcing set of M. It implies that $af(G, M) \leq |S \setminus \{e_j\}| = r - 1$, a contradiction.

To the contrary, suppose $C_i, C_j \in \mathcal{A}$ are incompatible. Then there exists an edge $e \in (E(C_i) \cap E(C_j)) \setminus M$. It follows that $T + e_i + e_j - e$ contains exactly one cycle and this cycle is not M-alternating. So M is a unique perfect matching of graph $T + e_i + e_j - e$. Hence $(S \setminus \{e_i, e_j\}) \cup \{e\}$ can be an anti-forcing set of M in G, and $af(G, M) \leq |(S \setminus \{e_i, e_j\}) \cup \{e\}| = r - 1$, a contradiction. □

Claim 2. $G = \bigcup_{i=1}^{r} C_i$.

Proof. For any edge $e \in E(G) \setminus M$, $G - e$ is connected since G is 2-connected. Suppose e does not appear in any cycle of $\mathcal{A}$. Then $\mathcal{A}$ also is a compatible M-alternating set of $G - e$. By Theorems 1.1 and 3.1, we have $r = |\mathcal{A}| \leq Af(G - e) \leq r(G - e) = r - 1$, a contradiction. For an edge $f \in M$, any adjacent edge of f is not in M and appears in an M-alternating cycle of $\mathcal{A}$, so f appears in such a cycle. □

Claim 3. Any two cycles of $\mathcal{A}$ have at most one common edge in M.

Proof. If two cycles C_i and C_j in $\mathcal{A}$ have more than one common edges in M, then such common edges belong to M and are thus disjoint. So $C_i \cup C_j \subseteq T + e_i + e_j$ and has the cyclomatic number at least three, contradicting $r(T + e_i + e_j) = 2$. □

An edge of M is called a *shared edge* if it belongs to at least two cycles of $\mathcal{A}$. Since G is connected, each cycle of $\mathcal{A}$ has at least one shared edge.

Claim 4. $\mathcal{A}$ has a cycle that has exactly one shared edge.

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that each cycle of $\mathcal{A}$ has at least two common edges. Then $\mathcal{A}$ has a cyclic sequence of cycles $C_{i_1}, C_{i_2}, \ldots, C_{i_s}$, $s \geq 3$, such that just all pairs of consecutive C_{i_j} and $C_{i_{j+1}}$ have one common edge for $1 \leq j \leq s$. This implies $r(\cup_{j=1}^{s} C_{i_j}) = s + 1$, contradicting that $r(T + e_{i_1} + e_{i_2} + \cdots + e_{i_s}) = s$. □

We now prove the necessity by induction on r. For the case $r = 1$, G is an even cycle, so the result is trivial. Suppose now that $r \geq 2$.

By Claim 4 let C_r be a cycle of $\mathcal{A}$ that has exactly one shared edge $u_r v_r$. Then the vertices of C_r except u_r and v_r are of degree 2. Let $P_r := C_r - u_r v_r$, and G_{r-1} the graph obtained from G by deleting the inner vertices of the path P_r. Then $M_{r-1} =$

$M \cap E(G_{r-1})$ is a perfect matching of G_{r-1}, and $u_r v_r \in M_{r-1}$. Note that $G_{r-1} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{r-1} C_i$ is an elementary bipartite graph with $r(G_{r-1}) = r - 1 \geq 1$, and $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{C_r\}$ is a compatible M_{r-1}-alternating set of G_{r-1}. Therefore $Af(G_{r-1}) = r - 1$. By the induction hypothesis, G_{r-1} has an ear decomposition $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_{r-1})$ such that $M_i = M_{r-1} \cap E(G_i)$ is a perfect matching of G_i $(1 \leq i \leq r-1)$, and the two end vertices u_i and v_i of the i-th ear P_i are adjacent in G_{i-1}, and $u_i v_i \in M_{i-1}$. Adding P_r to G_{r-1} we obtain the required ear decomposition $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_{r-1}, G_r)$ of G. □

From Lemma 3.4 we have that an elementary bipartite graph G with $Af(G) = r(G)$ must be planar. This follows easily from the specific ear decomposition. So from the above lemmas we have the following immediate consequences.

Theorem 3.5. Let G be a graph G with a perfect matching. Then $Af(G) = r(G)$ if and only if G is a planar bipartite graph and each block is either a fixed edge or a normal component with an ear decomposition as described in Lemma 3.4.

Corollary 3.6. Let G be an elementary graph with $r(G) \geq 2$ and $Af(G) = r(G)$. Then G has a unique perfect matching M such that $af(G, M) = r(G)$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.5 we have that G is a planar elementary bipartite graph. We proceed by induction on $r(G)$. For the case $r(G) = 2$, by Lemma 3.4, G is the union of two even cycles which have just one common edge e, and e must belong to perfect matching M of G with $af(G, M) = r(G)$. The result holds from that G has a unique perfect matching M containing e.

We now consider the case $r := r(G) \geq 3$. Because $Af(G) = r(G)$, for a perfect matching M with $af(G, M) = r$, by Lemma 3.4 and its proof, G has an ear decomposition $(G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_r(= G))$ such that $M_i = M \cap E(G_i)$ is a perfect matching of G_i, and for the two ends u_i and v_i of the i-th ear P_i, $u_i v_i \in M_{i-1}$. So $G = G_{r-1} + P_r$ and $af(G_{r-1}, M_{r-1}) = r-1$. For any (other) perfect matching M' of G with $af(G, M') = r$, G also has an ear decomposition $(G'_1, G'_2, \ldots, G'_r(= G))$ with the above properties. The other corresponding notations are given: P'_i, u'_i and v'_i, and M'_i. We want to show $M = M'$.

Let $C'_i := P'_i + u'_i v'_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq r$. Then by the proof of Lemma 3.4 $\mathcal{A}' = \{C'_1, C'_2, \ldots, C'_r\}$ is a compatible M'-alternating set of G, any two cycles of $\mathcal{A}'$ have at most one common edge in M', and $G = \bigcup_{i=1}^{r} C'_i$. Hence P_r is passed through by a cycle of $\mathcal{A}'$. Since G is simple, P_r is a path with at least 3 edges. So P_r has an edge not in M'. This implies that just one cycle of $\mathcal{A}'$ can pass through P_r, say C'_{i_0}.

Claim. $u_r v_r \in M'$.

Proof. To the contrary, suppose $u_r v_r \notin M'$. Since $P_r \subset C'_{i_0}$, P_r is an M'-alternating path. If both terminal edges of P_r are not in M', then C'_{i_0} has to pass the two edges

f and g of G_{r-1} which are in M' and incident to u_r and v_r. Since $G = \bigcup_{i=1}^{r} C'_i$, $u_r v_r$ is passed by a cycle $C'_{j_0} \in \mathcal{A}'$ ($j_0 \neq i_0$). Noting that C'_{j_0} is M'-alternating and $f, g \in M'$, C'_{j_0} has to pass f and g. So C'_{i_0} and C'_{j_0} have at least two common edges in M', a contradiction. Now suppose both terminal edges of P_r belong to M'. Then $C'_{i_0} = P_r + u_r v_r$. Let f be an edge of G_{r-1} adjacent to $u_r v_r$. Then $f \notin M'$ and $\mathcal{A}'$ has one cycle $C'_{i'_0}$ which passes through f and thus through P_r. So C'_{i_0} and C'_{i_0} both contain P_r. This implies that they have at least one common edge not in M', contradicting that C'_{i_0} and C'_{i_0} are compatible. □

By the claim, $C'_{i_0} = P_r + u_r v_r$. so $G_{r-1} = \bigcup_{i=1,\neq i_0}^{r-1} C'_i$, and $M'|_{G_{r-1}} := M' \cap E(G_{r-1})$ is a perfect matching of G_{r-1}. Further G_{r-1} has compatible $M'|_{G_{r-1}}$-alternating set $\mathcal{A}' \setminus \{C'_{i_0}\}$ and compatible M_{r-1}-alternating set $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{C_r\}$, which implies that $af(G_{r-1}, M'|_{G_{r-1}}) = af(G_{r-1}, M_{r-1}) = r - 1$. By the induction hypothesis, $M_{r-1} = M'|_{G_{r-1}}$. On the other hand, $M \cap E(P_r) = M' \cap E(P_r)$. Hence $M = M'$. □



Fig. 2. An all-kink catahex (left) and a straight chain polyomino (right).

A *polyomino* (resp. *hexagonal system*) G is a finite connected subgraph of a hexagonal (resp. square) grid in the plane such that and each edge is contained in a regular square (resp. hexagon) and every interior face is surrounded by a regular square (resp. hexagon). A polyomino graph is a *straight chain* if it is 2-connected and each vertex is contained in at most two squares. A hexagonal system H is called *all-kink catahex* if each vertex is contained in at most two hexagons and there is no hexagon such that its intersections with two other hexagons are two parallel edges (see Fig. 2).

For a straight chain polyomino (resp. an all-kink catahex) G, we can construct a perfect matching of G such that each square (resp. hexagon) is M-alternating. By Theorems 1.1 and 3.1, we have $af(G, M) = Af(G) = r(G)$. Conversely, suppose that a hexagonal system (resp. polyomino) G has a perfect matching M such that $af(G, M) = Af(G) = r(G)$. By Lemma 3.3 we have that G is elementary since it has no cut edges. Lemma 3.4 implies that G has an M-alternating hexagon (resp. square) which has at most one adjacent hexagon (resp. square) and the common edge belongs to M. So by the inductive way we can confirm the necessities of the following results.

Corollary 3.7. [12] Let G be a hexagonal system with n hexagons. Then $Af(G) = n$ if and only if G is an all-kink catahex.

Corollary 3.8. Let G be a polyomino graph with n squares. Then $Af(G) = n$ if and only if G is a straight chain.

4 Anti-forcing spectra of even polygonal chains

Let G be a connected plane graph. The boundary of G means the boundary of the exterior face of G. G is called *outerplane* if all the vertices of G are on the boundary. A *face cycle* of G means the boundary of an interior face if it is a cycle. A 2-connected plane bipartite graph G is called an *even polygonal chain* if G is outerplane and each face cycle is adjacent at most two face cycles. As special cases, some molecular graphs are even polygonal chains, such as hexagonal chains and phenylene chains. By Theorem 1.4, an even polygonal chain is elementary. By Theorem 2.10 in [27], each interior face of an even polygonal chain is resonant.

An edge of an even polygonal chain G is called *boundary edge* if it is on the boundary of G. An edge of G is called *shared* if it is the common edge of two face cycles. A face cycle of G is called *terminal* if it has only one shared edge of G. A face cycle s of G is called a *kink* if it has two shared edges that can be contained simultaneously in a perfect matching of s, that is, the two edges go clockwise along s from white (resp. black) ends to black (resp. white) ends. If all the face cycles of G except for the terminal are kinks, then we say G *all-kink*. For example, a straight chain polyomino is all-kink. G is called a *linear chain* if it has no kinks. A subchain of G is called a *maximal linear chain* if it can not be contained in a linear subchain with more face cycles.

Lemma 4.1 [27]**.** Let G be a plane elementary bipartite graph with a perfect matching M, C an M-alternating cycle. Then there exists an M-resonant face in the interior of C.

Lemma 4.2 [27]**.** Let G be a plane elementary bipartite graph. Then $Z(G)$ is connected.

Let G be a plane bipartite graph with a perfect matching M. Given a compatible M-alternating set $\mathcal{A}$, two cycles C_1 and C_2 of $\mathcal{A}$ are *crossing* if they share an edge e in M and the four edges adjacent to e alternate in C_1 and C_2 (i.e., C_1 enters into C_2 from one side and leaves for the other side via e). $\mathcal{A}$ *is non-crossing* if any two cycles in $\mathcal{A}$ are not crossing. For hexagonal systems, Lei et al. [12] proved that any compatible M-alternating set can be changed to a non-crossing compatible M-alternating set with the same cardinality. This result can be generalized to plane bipartite graphs in the same way as follows.

Lemma 4.3. If G has a compatible M-alternating set $\mathcal{A}$, then G admits a non-crossing compatible M-alternating set with size $|\mathcal{A}|$.

4.1 Continuity

In this subsection we show that the anti-forcing spectrum of any even polygonal chain is an integer interval.

Let G be an even polygonal chain with a perfect matching M. For an M-alternating cycle C in G, let $f(C)$ be the number of faces in the interior of C. By Theorem 1.2 and Lemma 4.3, we can choose a maximum non-crossing compatible M-alternating set $\mathcal{A}$ such that $|\mathcal{A}| = af(G, M)$ and $f(\mathcal{A}) = \sum_{C\in\mathcal{A}} f(C)$ is as small as possible. By using these notations, we have following lemmas.

Lemma 4.4. $\mathcal{A}$ contains all M-alternating face cycles in G, and any two non-face cycles in $\mathcal{A}$ are inner disjoint and have at most one common edge in M.

Proof. Suppose that G has an M-alternating face cycle $s \notin \mathcal{A}$. Then there exists a cycle $C \in \mathcal{A}$ such that C and s are not compatible. That is, C and s have a common edge not in M. So s must be in the interior of C. We claim that $(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{C\}) \cup \{s\}$ is a compatible M-alternating set. Otherwise there is a cycle $C' \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{C\}$ which is not compatible with s. So s is in the interior of C'. This implies that C and C' are either incompatible or crossing, a contradiction. Since $f(C) > 1$, $f((\mathcal{A} \setminus \{C\}) \cup \{s\}) < f(\mathcal{A})$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\mathcal{A}$ has two non-face cycles C_1 and C_2 such that C_1 is contained in the interior of C_2. By Lemma 4.1, there exists an M-alternating face cycle s_1 in the interior of C_1. By the above proof, $s_1 \in \mathcal{A}$. Since G is a chain, s and C_1 must have two common edges, which belong to M and also to C_2. This implies that C_1 and C_2 have a common edge not in M, a contradiction. Hence any two cycles in $\mathcal{A}$ are inner disjoint and have at most one common edge in M. □

Lemma 4.5. G has a unique maximum non-crossing compatible M-alternating set $\mathcal{A}_M$ such that $f(\mathcal{A}_M)$ is minimum.

Proof. To the contrary, suppose there is another maximum non-crossing compatible M-alternating set $\mathcal{A}$ such that $f(\mathcal{A}) = f(\mathcal{A}_M)$. By Lemma 4.4, all M-alternating face cycles belong to $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{A}_M$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}_M$ are different, there exists a pair of non-face cycles $C \in \mathcal{A}$ and $C' \in \mathcal{A}_M$ that are incompatible. Since G is outerplane, C and C' must have a common region in their interiors. Let Q be the boundary of the common region. Then Q is an M-alternating cycle. Note that $f(Q)$ is less than at least one of $f(C)$ and $f(C')$, say $f(C)$. By Lemma 4.4, any cycle of $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{C\}$ is non-crossing and compatible with Q. Therefore $(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{C\}) \cup \{Q\}$ is a maximum non-crossing compatible M-alternating set with $f((\mathcal{A} \setminus \{C\}) \cup \{Q\}) < f(\mathcal{A})$, a contradiction. □

Lemma 4.6. For two perfect matchings M and M' of G such that $s = M \triangle M'$ is a face cycle of G, $|af(G, M) - af(G, M')| \leq 2$. If $af(G, M) - af(G, M') = 2$, then (i) s is

a kink that is not 4-cycle, (ii) $\mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{s\}$ contains exactly two cycles C_e and C_f passing through the two shared edges e and f of s respectively, and (iii) $\mathcal{A}_{M'} = \mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{C_e, C_f\}$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.4, $s \in \mathcal{A}_M \cap \mathcal{A}_{M'}$. There are two cases to be considered.

Case 1. s is not a kink of G. Since s is both M and M'-alternating, s has at most one shared edge in M. Then there is at most one possible cycle $C \in \mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{s\}$ which passes through some edge of s, and $\mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{C\}$ also is a compatible M'-alternating set since M and M' differ only on s. So $|\mathcal{A}_M| - 1 \leq |\mathcal{A}_{M'}|$. Similarly, $|\mathcal{A}_{M'}| - 1 \leq |\mathcal{A}_M|$. Therefore $||\mathcal{A}_M| - |\mathcal{A}_{M'}|| \leq 1$.

Case 2. s is a kink of G. Let e and f be the two shared edges of s. Then $\{e, f\} \subset M$ or M', say M. There is at most one cycle $C \in \mathcal{A}_{M'} \setminus \{s\}$ such that s is in the interior of C, so $\mathcal{A}_{M'} \setminus \{C\}$ is a compatible M-alternating set. Hence $|\mathcal{A}_{M'}| - 1 \leq |\mathcal{A}_M|$.

On the other hand, there is at most two possible cycles C_e and C_f in $\mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{s\}$ that pass e and f respectively. Then $\mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{C_e, C_f\}$ is a compatible M'-alternating set. So $|\mathcal{A}_M| - 2 \leq |\mathcal{A}_{M'}|$. So the first part of the lemma holds.

From now on suppose $|\mathcal{A}_M| - |\mathcal{A}_{M'}| = 2$. Then members C_e and C_f in $\mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{s\}$ must exist and $\mathcal{A}' := \mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{C_e, C_f\}$ is a maximum compatible M'-alternating set. This implies that $\mathcal{A}'$ has no a cycle containing s in its interior. We have that s is not 4-cycle. Otherwise, $C = (C_e \cup C_f) \triangle s$ is an M'-alternating cycle that is compatible with each cycle in $\mathcal{A}'$, contradicting that $\mathcal{A}'$ is maximum. So statements (i) and (ii) hold.

The remaining is to prove that $\mathcal{A}_{M'} = \mathcal{A}'$. Suppose $\mathcal{A}_{M'} \neq \mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{C_e, C_f\}$. By Lemma 4.5, $f(\mathcal{A}_{M'}) < f(\mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{C_e, C_f\})$. So $\mathcal{A}_{M'}$ contains a non-face cycle C' such that C' is incompatible with C_e or C_f with respect to M, say C_e. Otherwise $\mathcal{A}_{M'} \cup \{C_e, C_f\}$ can be a maximum non-crossing compatible M-alternating set with $f(\mathcal{A}_{M'} \cup \{C_e, C_f\}) < f(\mathcal{A}_M)$, a contradiction. Since G is a chain, the interiors of C' and C_e must have a common region. Let Q' be the boundary of the common area. Then Q' is an M-alternating cycle. Note that Q' is compatible with any M-alternating face cycle, and $f(Q') < f(C_e)$. By Lemma 4.4, Q' is compatible with each cycle of $\mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{C_e\}$. Hence $(\mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{C_e\}) \cup \{Q'\}$ can be a maximum non-crossing compatible M-alternating set with $f((\mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{C_e\}) \cup \{Q'\}) < f(\mathcal{A}_M)$, a contradiction. □



Fig. 3. Illustration for the proof of Lemma 4.7, s is a square.

Lemma 4.7. If $\mathcal{A}_M$ contains a non-face cycle C, then there is an M-alternating 4-cycle s in the interior of C such that $af(G, M') = af(G, M) + 1$, where $M' = M \triangle s$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, there is an M-alternating face cycle s in the interior of C. By Lemma 4.4, $s \in \mathcal{A}_M$. So s and C are compatible. Since G is a chain, s must be a 4-cycle. By Lemma 4.6, $||\mathcal{A}_{M'}| - |\mathcal{A}_M|| \leq 1$. Let g and d (resp. e and f) be the boundary (resp. shared) edges of G in s. Then $g, d \in M$ and $e, f \in M'$. See Fig. 3, $C - g - d + e + f$ is the disjoint union of two cycles C_e and C_f which pass through e and f respectively. Since M and M' differ only on s, C_e and C_f both are M'-alternating, and $(\mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{C\}) \cup \{C_e, C_f\}$ is a compatible M'-alternating set. Hence $|\mathcal{A}_M| + 1 \leq |\mathcal{A}_{M'}|$, which implies $|\mathcal{A}_M| + 1 = |\mathcal{A}_{M'}|$. By Theorem 1.2, $af(G, M') = af(G, M) + 1$. □

According to Lemma 4.7, the following result is immediate.

Corollary 4.8. For a perfect matching M of G with $af(G, M) = Af(G)$, $af(G, M)$ equals the number of M-resonant faces.



Fig. 4. Illustration for the proof of Lemma 4.9, s' is a square.

Lemma 4.9. Let M and M' be perfect matchings of G such that $s = M \triangle M'$ a face cycle in G. If $af(G, M) - af(G, M') = 2$, then there is a perfect matching M'' in G such that $af(G, M'') = af(G, M') + 1$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.6, s is a kink of length at least 6 and has two shared edges e and f in M, $\mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{s\}$ contains exactly two cycles C_e and C_f passing through e and f respectively, and $\mathcal{A}_{M'} = \mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{C_e, C_f\}$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{A}_M$ contains a non-face cycle C'. By Lemma 4.7, there is an M-alternating face cycle s' of length 4 in the interior of C'. Note that s' is disjoint with s and thus M'-alternating. By Lemma 4.4, $s, s' \in \mathcal{A}_M \cap \mathcal{A}_{M'}$. If C' also belongs to $\mathcal{A}_{M'}$, by Lemma 4.7, then $af(G, M'') = af(G, M') + 1$, where $M'' = M' \triangle s'$. For the case $C' \notin \mathcal{A}_{M'}$, C' is either C_e or C_f, say $C' = C_e$. Let g' and d' (resp. e' and f') be the two boundary (resp. shared) edges of s'. Then $C' - g' - d' + e' + f'$ is the disjoint union of two cycles $C_{e'}$ and $C_{f'}$ such that $e' \in C_{e'}$ and $f', e \in C_{f'}$ see Fig. 4). $C_{e'}$ is M''-alternating, so $\mathcal{A}_{M'} \cup \{C_{e'}\}$ is a compatible M''-alternating set. Hence $|\mathcal{A}_{M'}| + 1 \leq |\mathcal{A}_{M''}|$. On the other hand, by Lemma 4.6, $af(G, M'') \leq af(G, M') + 1$. By Theorem 1.2, $af(G, M'') = af(G, M') + 1$.

From now on suppose all members of $\mathcal{A}_M$ are face cycles. So C_e and C_f both are face cycles and the number of M-resonant faces of G is $|\mathcal{A}_M|$. Let G_M be the graph formed by all M-alternating face cycles of G. Then each component of G_M is an all-kink

subchain. A component of G_M is called a *single component* if it is a single face cycle, is *non-single component* otherwise. It is obvious that G_M has a component containing three face cycles C_e, s and C_f. So G_M has at least one non-single component.

For convenience, we define an orientation of chain G from left to right whenever we go along it from C_e, s to C_f. Let L_0 be the leftmost non-single component of G_M in G. Let s_0 be the left terminal face cycle in L_0, and s_0^- and s_0^+ the left and right neighboring face cycles of s_0 in G respectively. It is possible that $s_0^+ = s$. Let $M_1 = M \triangle s_0$. By the first part of Lemma 4.4, $\mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{s_0^+\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{M_1}$. So $|\mathcal{A}_M| - 1 \leq |\mathcal{A}_{M_1}|$.

If s_0 is the left terminal face cycle in G (i.e., s_0^- does not exist), then $|\mathcal{A}_{M_1}| = |\mathcal{A}_M| - 1$. Letting $M'' = M_1$, $af(G, M'') = af(G, M') + 1$. So suppose that s_0^- exists. Let e_0 and f_0 be the left and right shared edges of s_0 respectively. Then $f_0 \in M$.

Let $e_0 \in M$. If $\mathcal{A}_{M_1}$ contain a cycle C_0 such that s_0 is in its interior, then s_0 must be a 4-cycle. Note that $M = M_1 \triangle s_0$. By Lemma 4.7, $af(G, M) = af(G, M_1) + 1$. Otherwise $\mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{s_0^+\} = \mathcal{A}_{M_1}$. Then $af(G, M_1) = af(G, M) - 1 = af(G, M') + 1$.

So suppose that $e_0 \notin M$. Then $e_0 \in M_1$ and $f_0 \notin M_1$. If $\mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{s_0^+\} = \mathcal{A}_{M_1}$, then $|\mathcal{A}_{M_1}| = |\mathcal{A}_M| - 1$ and the result holds. Otherwise, $\mathcal{A}_{M_1}$ must contain just one M_1-alternating cycle D_1 which is compatible with each cycle of $\mathcal{A}_M \setminus \{s_0^+\}$. So D_1 passes e_0 and contains s_0^- in its interior. So $|\mathcal{A}_{M_1}| = |\mathcal{A}_M|$. If D_1 is a non-face cycle, by Lemma 4.7, there is a 4-cycle s_0' in the interior of D_1 such that $M_1 \triangle s_0'$ is a perfect matching of G with $|\mathcal{A}_{M_1 \triangle s_0'}| = |\mathcal{A}_{M_1}| + 1$. It implies that $|\mathcal{A}_{M' \triangle s_0'}| = |\mathcal{A}_{M'}| + 1$. Let $M'' = M' \triangle s_0'$. Then $af(G, M'') = af(G, M') + 1$. Now suppose D_1 is an M_1-alternating face cycle. Then $D_1 = s_0^-$, and each cycle of $\mathcal{A}_{M_1}$ is a face cycle. It clear that there is a non-single component in G_{M_1} since s_0 and s_0^- are adjacent M_1-alternating face cycles. Let L_1 be the most left non-single component of G_{M_1} in G, and s_1 the left terminal face cycle of L_1. Then s_1 lies on the left side of s_0 in G. Repeating the above procedure, finally we can find a perfect matching M'' in G such that $af(G, M'') = af(G, M') + 1$ since G has a finite number of face cycles. □

Theorem 4.10. The anti-forcing spectrum of an even polygonal chain G is continuous.

Proof. Let M and M' be two perfect matchings in G such that $af(G, M) = af(G)$ and $af(G, M') = Af(G)$. By Lemma 4.2, there is a path $M_1(= M)M_2 \cdots M_n(= M')$ in $Z(G)$. By Lemma 4.6, $|af(G, M_i) - af(G, M_{i+1})| \leq 2$ for all $1 \leq i < n$. If $|af(G, M_i) - af(G, M_{i+1})| = 2$, by Lemma 4.9, there is a perfect matching M'' in G such that $|af(G, M_i) - af(G, M'')| = 1$ and $|af(G, M'') - af(G, M_{i+1})| = 1$. Therefore, there is no gap in $\mathrm{Spec}_{af}(G)$. □

4.2 Minimum anti-forcing number

Let G be an even polygonal chain. Label the face cycles of G as $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n$ from left to right. If G has no kink, then itself is a segment. Let s_i be the first kink of G.



Fig. 5. Segment decomposition of G, kinks are signed by k, anti-forcing edge of each segment is marked by a bar.

If s_i is a 4-cycle, then the subchain $s_1 + s_2 + \cdots + s_i$ is called the first segment of G. Otherwise, the subchain $s_1 + s_2 + \cdots + s_j$ or $s_1 + s_2 + \cdots + s_n$ is called the first segment of G, denoted by L_1, according as G has the second kink s_j or no. Let $G - L_1$ be the subchain obtained by removing the face cycles of L_1 from G. Precisely, $G - L_1$ consists of all face cycles of G but not in L_1. If $L_1 \neq G$, similarly let L_2 be the first segment of $G - L_1$ as the second segment of G. Repeating this procedure, G can be decomposed into a sequence of segments $(L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_t)$, $t \geq 1$, called the *segment decomposition* of G (see Fig. 5). Obviously, each segment L_i has an anti-forcing edge by Theorem 2.4 (see Fig. 5). Since G is elementary, by Theorem 1.3 or 1.4 G has at least two perfect matchings, $af(G) \geq 1$.

Theorem 4.11. Let $(L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_t)$ be the segment decomposition of an even polygonal chain G. Then $af(G) = t$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on t. For the case $t = 1$, G itself is a segment, so G has an anti-forcing edge, and $af(G) = 1$. Suppose $t \geq 2$. The anti-forcing edges of all segments L_i $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, t)$ form an anti-forcing set of a perfect matching of G. So $af(G) \leq t$. We only need to prove $af(G) \geq t$. Let s_{i_0} be the right terminal face cycle of L_1.

Let M be a perfect matching of G with $af(G, M) = af(G)$. Note that $(L_2, L_3, \ldots, L_t)$ is the segment decomposition of $G - L_1$. By the induction hypothesis, we have that $af(G - L_1) = t - 1$. There are two cases to be considered.

Case 1. The restriction of M to $G - L_1$ is a perfect matching of $G - L_1$. Since s_{i_0} is a kink of G, the restriction of M to $L_1 - s_{i_0}$ is a perfect matching of $L_1 - s_{i_0}$. Let S be any minimum anti-forcing set of M. By Theorem 1.1, $S \cap E(G - L_1)$ and $S \cap E(L_1 - s_{i_0})$ are anti-forcing sets of $G - L_1$ and $L_1 - s_{i_0}$ respectively. Since $af(G - L_1) = t - 1$ and $af(L_1 - s_{i_0}) \geq 1$, S contains at least $t - 1$ edges in $G - L_1$ and at least one edge of $L_1 - s_{i_0}$. So $t \leq |S|$, i.e., $t \leq af(G)$.

Case 2. The restriction of M to $G - L_1$ is not a perfect matching of $G - L_1$. Let e_1 (resp. f_1) be the shared edge between $L_1 - s_{i_0}$ (resp. $G - L_1$) and s_{i_0}. Then $e_1, f_1 \notin M$. Since s_{i_0} is a kink of G, s_{i_0} is M-alternating. Let $M_1 = M \triangle s_{i_0}$. Then M_1 is a perfect matching of G and $e_1, f_1 \in M_1$. By Lemma 4.6, $af(G, M_1) \leq af(G, M) + 2$.

Note that the restriction of M_1 to $G - L_1$ is a perfect matching of $G - L_1$. Also, any minimum anti-forcing set S_1 of M_1 contains at least $t-1$ edges of $G - L_1$. On the other hand, the restriction of M_1 to $L_1 - s_{i_0}$ also is a perfect matching of $L_1 - s_{i_0}$. $L_1 - s_{i_0}$ contains an M_1-alternating cycle C_1 which is compatible with s_{i_0}. By Theorem 1.1, S_1 must contain at least two edges of L_1. If $af(G, M_1) \leq af(G, M) + 1$, then $t + 1 \leq |S_1| \leq af(G, M) + 1$, i.e., $t \leq af(G)$.

Suppose that $af(G, M_1) = af(G, M) + 2$. By Lemma 4.6, s_{i_0} is not a 4-cycle, and $\mathcal{A}_{M_1} \setminus \{s_{i_0}\}$ includes a cycle C_{e_1} in $L_1 - s_{i_0}$ passing through e_1. If C_{e_1} is not a face cycle, by Lemma 4.1, then there is an M_1-alternating face cycle s' in the interior of C_{e_1}. By Lemma 4.4, s', s_{i_0} and C_{e_1} all belong to $\mathcal{A}_{M_1}$, which implies that S_1 includes at least three edges of L_1. Consequently, $t + 2 \leq |S_1| = af(G, M) + 2$, i.e., $t \leq af(G)$. So we may assume that $C_{e_1} = s_{i_0-1}$ is a face cycle. Since s_{i_0} is not a 4-cycle, L_1 contains another kink s_i of G, $2 \leq i \leq i_0 - 1$. Let L_1' be the subchain consisting of face cycles $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_{i-1}$. It follows that the restriction of M_1 to L_1' is a perfect matching of L_1'. Also there is an M_1-alternating face cycle C_1' in L_1'. Hence s_{i_0}, s_{i_0-1} and C_1' are three compatible M_1-alternating cycles in L_1. Like the above, we have $t \leq af(G)$. □

Actually, Theorem 4.11 gives a linear algorithm to compute the anti-forcing number of any even polygonal chain. For example, the anti-forcing number of the even polygonal chain in Fig. 5 is 6. As special cases, the anti-forcing numbers of hexagonal chains and phenylene chains have been computed in [4] and [23], respectively.

Note that each segment of an all-kink even polygonal chain has at most three face cycles. For a real number x, let $\lceil x \rceil$ be the smallest integer not less than x. By Theorem 4.11, we have the following result.

Corollary 4.12. Let G be an all-kink even polygonal chain without 4-cycles and with n face cycles. Then $af(G) = \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$.

Corollary 4.13. Let G be a straight chain of n squares. Then $af(G) = \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$.

For any hexagonal chain H, Theorem 5 in [20] stated that $af(H) = \lceil \frac{k(H)}{2} \rceil$, where $k(H)$ is the number of maximal linear chains of H. In fact this is not correct in general. For example, for an all-kink hexagonal chain L with $n \geq 2$ hexagons, from Corollary 4.12 we have $af(L) = \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$. But $k(L) = n - 1$, and $\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil > \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$ for all $n \geq 8$.

4.3 Maximum anti-forcing number

For an even polygonal chain G, from Lemma 3.4 we can see that $Af(G) = r(G)$ if and only if G is all-kink. Here the cyclomatic number $r(G)$ equals the number of interior faces of G. Our approach to compute $Af(G)$ is to decompose G into some all-kink subchains that contain face cycles as many as possible.



Fig. 6. A maximal linear chain with terminals t and t'.

Lemma 4.14. Let M be a perfect matching of G and B a maximal linear chain of G. Then B contains at most two M-alternating face cycles. Further, if B contains exactly two M-alternating face cycles, then they are neighboring.

Proof. Suppose B has an M-alternating face cycle s. Let e be the right shared edge of s (see Fig. 6). If $e \notin M$, then no right face cycles of s in B are M-alternating. Suppose $e \in M$ and s has a right neighboring face cycle s'. Then s' may be M-alternating and the other right faces (if there exist) of s in B are not M-alternating (in fact, if s' is non-kink, then s' must be M-alternating). On the left side of s, the corresponding facts also hold. So B has three M-alternating face cycles only if both shared edges of s belong to M. In this case, s itself is a kink, i.e., a terminal face cycle of B. Hence the lemma holds. □

Let G be a graph with a perfect matching M, and G' is a subgraph of G such that the restriction of M to G' is a perfect matching of G'. Then $G - V(G')$ either has a perfect matching or is empty. If $G - V(G')$ has pendant edges (with an end of degree one), then delete the ends of those pendant edges and their incident edges from $G - V(G')$. Repeating this process, until we obtain a graph without pendant edges, denoted by $G \ominus G'$. Obviously, all these pendant edges happen in this process are contained in M.



Fig. 7. An all-kink decomposition $(B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4, B_5)$ of G, kinks are marked by k and bold edges form a perfect matching F.

Let $B_1 = s_1 + s_2 + \cdots + s_i$ $(1 \le i \le n)$ be the first maximal all-kink subchain of G_1 from the left terminal s_1. That is, B_1 itself is an all-kink chain, but $B_1 + s_{i+1}$ is not. If $G_2 := G \ominus B_1 \neq \emptyset$, then subchain G_2 has the first maximal all-kink subchain B_2. Let $G_3 = G_2 \ominus B_2$. Keeping on this procedure, we finally obtain an even polygonal chain G_m such that $G_m \ominus B_m = \emptyset$, where B_m is the first maximal all-kink subchain of G_m. Then $(B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_m)$ is called an *all-kink decomposition* of G (see Fig. 7). Note that

the last face cycle of each B_t is not kink of G. By using these notations, we give the following result.

Theorem 4.15. $Af(G) = \sum_{t=1}^{m} r(B_t)$.

Proof. Let k be the number of kinks of G. We proceed by induction on k. We first consider the case $k = 0$. Then G is a linear chain. By Corollary 4.8 and Lemma 4.14, $Af(G) \leq 2$. If G is a single cycle, the result is trivial. So assume $r(G) \geq 2$. Then $r(B_1) = 2$ and $G \ominus B_1 = \emptyset$. G has a perfect matching M such that first two face cycles are M-alternating. Hence $2 \leq af(G, M) \leq Af(G)$. So $Af(G) = r(B_1) = 2$.

Suppose $k \geq 1$. G has a perfect matching F such that all shared edges of each B_t $(1 \leq t \leq m)$ belong to M. So all face cycles of each B_t are F-alternating. So those F-alternating face cycles form a compatible F-alternating set of G. By Theorem 1.2, $\sum_{t=1}^{m} r(B_t) \leq af(G, F) \leq Af(G)$. In the following, we want to prove $\sum_{t=1}^{m} r(B_t) \geq Af(G)$. To this end, we choose a perfect matching M of G such that $af(G, M) = Af(G)$.

If $G \ominus B_1 = \emptyset$, then $G - B_1$ is empty or a linear chain. Let s_{i-1} and s_i be the last two face cycles of B_1. Since $k \geq 1$, $i \geq 3$ and s_{i-1} is the last kink of G. So $J = s_{i-1} + s_i + (G - B_1)$ is a maximal linear chain of G. By Lemma 4.14, there are at most two M-resonant faces in J, and at most $(r(B_1) - 2)$ M-resonant faces in $B_1 - s_{i-1} - s_i$. By Corollary 4.8, $Af(G) \leq r(B_1)$.

Now suppose $G \ominus B_1 \neq \emptyset$. Note that the last face cycle s_i of B_1 is not a kink of G. So G must have a kink after s_i. Let s_j $(i < j < n)$ be the first kink of G in $G - B_1$. Then $G_2 = G \ominus B_1 = G - s_1 - s_2 - \cdots - s_j$. Note that $(B_2, B_3, \ldots, B_m)$ is an all-kink decomposition of G_2. Since G_2 has less kinks than G, by the induction hypothesis, $Af(G_2) = \sum_{t=2}^{m} r(B_t)$.

Let $H_1 = B_1 + s_{i+1} + s_{i+2} + \cdots + s_{j-1}$. Then $G = H_1 + s_j + G_2$. Since s_j is a kink of G, there are two cases to be considered.

Case 1. The restrictions of M to H_1 and G_2 are their perfect matchings. By the induction hypothesis and Corollary 4.8, H_1 and G_2 contain at most $r(B_1)$ and $\sum_{t=2}^{m} r(B_t)$ M-alternating face cycles respectively. If s_j is not M-alternating, then G contains at most $\sum_{t=1}^{m} r(B_t)$ M-alternating face cycles. If s_j is M-alternating, then the two shared edges of s_j both belong to M, and the restriction of M to $H_1 + s_j$ is also its perfect matching. Since B_1 itself is an all-kink decomposition of $H_1 + s_j$, $H_1 + s_j$ also contains at most $r(B_1)$ M-alternating face cycles. So G also contains at most $\sum_{t=1}^{m} r(B_t)$ M-alternating face cycles. By Corollary 4.8, $Af(G) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{m} r(B_t)$.

Case 2. The restrictions of M to H_1 and G_2 both are not their perfect matchings. So s_j is M-alternating, and none of the shared edges of s_j are in M. Note that $M \triangle s_j$ is a perfect matching of G such that the two shared edges of s_j both are in $M \triangle s_j$. So $|\mathcal{A}_{M \triangle s_j}| \geq |\mathcal{A}_M|$. By Theorem 1.2, $af(G, M \triangle s_j) \geq af(G, M) = Af(G)$, which implies

that $af(G, M\triangle s_j) = Af(G)$. Treating $M\triangle s_j$ as M in Case 1, we have the required result. □

An all-kink decomposition of an even polygonal chain can be accomplished in a linear time. So Theorem 4.15 provide a linear algorithm to find its maximal anti-forcing number. Combining Theorems 4.10 with the above linear algorithms to compute the minimum and maximum antiforcing numbers of even polygonal chains, we have the following conclusion.

Corollary 4.16. The anti-forcing spectrum of an even polygonal chain can be determined in linear time.

For instance, anti-forcing spectrum of even polygonal chain G in Fig. 7 is an integer interval $[6, 13]$.

References

[1] P. Adams, M. Mahdian and E. S. Mahmoodian, On the forced matching numbers of bipartite graphs, Discrete Math. 281 (2004) 1–12.

[2] P. Afshani, H. Hatami and E.S. Mahmoodian, On the spectrum of the forced matching number of graphs, Australas. J. Combin. 30 (2004) 147–160.

[3] Z. Che and Z. Chen, Forcing on perfect matchings-A survey, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. 66 (2011) 93–136.

[4] H. Deng, The anti-forcing number of hexagonal chains, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. 58 (2007) 675–682.

[5] H. Deng, The anti-forcing number of double hexagonal chains, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. 60 (2008) 183–192.

[6] K. Deng, H. Zhang, Anti-forcing spectra of perfect matchings of graphs, J. Comb. Optim., DOI: 10.1007/s10878-015-9986-3.

[7] P. Hansen and M. Zheng, Bonds fixed by fixing bonds, J. Chem. Inform. Comput. Sci. 34 (1994) 297–304.

[8] F. Harary, D. Klein and T. Živković, Graphical properties of polyhexes: perfect matching vector and forcing, J. Math. Chem. 6 (1991) 295–306.

[9] X. Jiang and H. Zhang, On forcing matching number of boron-nitrogen fullerene graphs, Discrete Appl. Math. 159 (2011) 1581–1593.

[10] X. Jiang and H. Zhang, The maximum forcing number of cylindrical grid, toroidal 4-8 lattice and Klein bottle 4-8 lattice, J. Math. Chem. 54 (2016) 18–32.

[11] D. Klein and M. Randić, Innate degree of freedom of a graph, J. Comput. Chem. 8 (1987) 516–521.

[12] H. Lei, Y. Yeh and H. Zhang, Anti-forcing numbers of perfect matchings of graphs, Discrete Appl. Math., DOI: 10.1016/j.dam.2015.08.024.

[13] X. Li, Hexagonal systems with forcing single edges, Discrete Appl. Math. 72 (1997) 295–301.

[14] L. Lovász and M. D. Plummer, Matching Theory, Annals of Discrete Mathematics, Vol. 29, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986.

[15] L. Lovász and M. D. Plummer, On minimal elementary bipartite graphs, J. Combin. Theory Ser. **B** 23 (1977) 127–138.

[16] E. S. Mahmoodian, R. Naserasr and M. Zaker, Defining sets in vertex colorings of graphs and Latin rectangles, Discrete Math. 167 (1997) 451–460.

[17] L. Pachter and P. Kim, Forcing matchings on square grids, Discrete Math. 190 (1998) 287–294.

[18] M.E. Riddle, The minimum forcing number for the torus and hypercube, Discrete Math. 245 (2002) 283–292.

[19] D. Vukičević and N. Trinajstić, On the anti-forcing number of benzenoids, J. Math. Chem. 42 (2007) 575–583.

[20] D. Vukičević and N. Trinajstić, On the anti-Kekulé number and anti-forcing number of cata-condensed bezenoids, J. Math. Chem. 43 (2008) 719–726.

[21] H. Wang, D. Ye and H. Zhang, The forcing number of toroidal polyhexes, J. Math. Chem. 43 (2008) 457–475.

[22] Q. Yang, H. Zhang, Y. Lin, On the anti-forcing number of fullerene graphs, MATCH Commun Math Comput Chem 74 (2015) 681–700.

[23] Q. Zhang, H. Bian and E. Vumar, On the anti-kekulé and anti-forcing number of cata-condensed phenylenes, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. 65 (2011) 799–806.

[24] H. Zhang and K. Deng, Forcing spectrum of a hexagonal system with a forcing edge, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. 73 (2015) 457–471.

[25] F. Zhang and X. Li, Hexagonal systems with forcing edges, Discrete Math. 140 (1995) 253–263.

[26] H. Zhang, D. Ye and W.C. Shiu, Forcing matching numbers of fullerene graphs, Discrete Appl. Math. 158 (2010) 573–582.

[27] H. Zhang and F. Zhang, Plane elementary bipartite graphs, Discrete Appl. Math. 105 (2000) 291–311.